

SECRET

CHAL-1147-60

Copy 6 of 6

28 AUG 1961

MEMORANDUM FOR: Office of the General Counsel

SUBJECT : Claim for Reimbursement for Travel of Dependents on TDY of Sponsor to Washington at Completion of Tour

25X1A

1. This paper contains a review of factors leading up to a claim being made by [ ] in connection with his travel at completion of his Agency tour. An opinion by General Counsel as to the merits of the claim is requested.

25X1A

2. The attached correspondence contains all the relevant facts in the case. Specifically, the claim is for cost of travel of dependents from Topeka, Kansas to Washington, D.C. and return. As noted in attached memorandum on this case, prepared by [ ] of MAFD, the Agency has for a long time been seeking a procedure whereby upon completion of an overseas tour military personnel would proceed directly to new assignment without processing thru Washington. It is contemplated under this plan that only key personnel would come to Washington for debriefing. The Agency Comptroller's office is working on a plan whereby actual separation would take place in the field and all travel expenses would be paid by the gaining unit. Pending a finalization of this plan, Development Projects Division worked out an interim plan which was forwarded to [ ] detachment on 4 June 1960 in [ ] (OUT 67769) (attached). This plan authorizes the traveler to proceed commercially from [ ] to the West Coast at Agency expense and from the West Coast to his new Air Force assignment at Air Force expense. Accounting for the travel outside the continental limits is made to the Agency and the XI portion is made to the Air Force. The travel within the XI is covered by a legitimate Air Force travel order (copy of [ ] is attached). The reason DPD allowed the commercial travel is found in Paragraph 2, C of [ ] (IN 24735) (attached) which advises that a 40 to 55 day notice would be necessary for MATS bookings and port calls. In view of the fact that a new over-all procedure was in the mill, it was felt that any attempt to change the existing system and then a short time later revise it again (i.e., by the plan cited above which the Agency Comptroller is finalizing) would be ineffectual and would call attention to the unit.

25X1A

25X1A

25X1C

25X1A

25X1A

SECRET

SECRET

CHAL-1147-60  
Copy 6 of 6

Page 2 of 2

25X1A

3. The pertinent section of the message to Detachment C as it affects [ ] case is contained in Paragraph 1:

1. All PCS MILPers authorized commercial travel on most direct route new assignment except those personnel required by HQS to report for consultation and debriefing. Dependents will not be covered by HQS TDY."

25X1A

25X1A

25X1A

25X1A

25X1A

25X1A

4. [ ] submitted his request for travel in [ ] (IN 26933) (attached). Hqs authorized the travel. In this message [ ] stated "dependents will accompany to Washington at [ ] expense." It was based on this that Hqs informed [ ] upon his submitting his claim, that the travel of dependents between Topeka, Kansas [ ] new station) and Washington was not authorized. Asked why he had notified Headquarters that dependents would travel to Washington at his expense, he stated that he had decided not to question the procedure by cable but that he would argue against it when in Washington. After his arrival at Hqs, he made known that his intention was to accept the decision "under protest," as it were, and reserve the right to have it judged at a later date.

25X1A

25X1A

25X1A

25X1A

5. The DFD approving and certifying officials feel that having made a decision they cannot reverse it without receiving an opinion from the Office of the General Counsel. They recognize that in the past, dependent travel of the type under discussion has been reimbursed. Furthermore, [ ] review of the case shows that there is a great deal of merit in [ ] claim. [ ] happened to travel just as a new policy was going into effect and as far as can be ascertained, this is the only case which will raise the problem. [ ] argues that prior to the plan in effect when he traveled, DFD reimbursed members of his own detachment for the same type of travel and that he should receive the same treatment.

6. It is requested that OGC review the case and provide DFD with an opinion as to whether or not it can approve the payment for dependent travel from Topeka, Kansas, to Washington and return.

SIGNED

STANLEY W. BEEHLE  
Colonel, USAF  
Acting Chief, DFD

Attachments: a/e

SECRET

**TOP SECRET**

CHAL 1149

Copy 7 of 7

22 August 1960

**CURRENT AND PROPOSED OPERATIONS****APPROVAL STATUS  
USAF - AGENCY/STATE****OPERATION****AREA****DATE****1. CHALICE**

25X1A	a. Middle East Missions (Photo)		Temporarily suspended	Approved	Pending
	b. HOT SHOP Missions		Temporarily suspended	Approved	Pending

**2. CORONA**

a. 9010		13 September 1960	N/R	Approved
---------	--	-------------------	-----	----------

**3. AIR SUPPORT**

25X1A	a.		- contingency plan	Iran	Continuing Basis	Not presented	Approved-Agency
25X1A	b.		- contingency plan	Laos	Continuing Basis	Not presented	Approved-Agency
	c.	JMAR C	- contingency plan	Cuba	Continuing Basis	N/R	Approved
25X1A	d.		(5 flights)	China	August 1960	N/R	Approved
25X1C	e.				October 1960	Pending	Pending
	f.		airlift support	Laos	Continuing Basis	N/R	Approved
	h.				Fall 1960	Pending	Pending

25X1A

**TOP SECRET**

OPERATIONS BRANCH

COMPLETED OPERATIONS FOR PERIOD 14 - 20 AUGUST 1960

25X1A

1. CORONA 9009 launch completed 19 August.
2. One C-54 JMARC "white" flight completed to
3. One C-124 JMARC "white" flight completed to
4. Mission 1066, CHALICE photography, Vandenberg AFB, 11 August.

PROPOSED OPERATIONS FOR PERIOD 21 - 27 AUGUST 1960

25X1A

1. One C-54 JMARC "white" flight to
2. One C-124 JMARC "white" flight to
3. One C-124 JMARC "white" flight to
4. One C-54 JMARC "white" flight to
5. One C-54 JMARC "black" flight to